S.No.	Name of States	Leopards		Tigers	
6.	Assam	246	N.R.	325	458
7.	Rajasthan	475	474	64	58
8.	Madhya Pradesh	1700	1851	912	927
9.	Uttar Pradesh	71	1412	465	475
10.	Andhra Pradesh	152	138	197	171
11.	Mizoram	49	28	28	12
12.	Gujarat	772	832	5	1
13.	Goa Daman & Diu	31	25	3	6
14.	Orissa	378	422	226	194
	Total			3375	3435
15.	Kerala	16	N.R.	57	N.R.
16.	Meghalaya	N.R.	N.R.	*53*	N.R.
17.	Tripura	18	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
18.	Nagaland	—	N.R.	83	N.R.
19.	Arunachal Pradesh	98	N.R.	180	N.R.
20.	Sikkim	—	N.R.	2	N.R.
21.	Haryana	25	N.R.	—.	—
22.	Himachal Pradesh	821	N.R.		—
23.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	15	15	—	—
Total		6828	5738	375	___

N.R.: Not Reported by States

Curbing Poaching of Tigers

657. SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state;

(a) whether the Supreme Court has recently directed the Union and State Govtrnments to take strict action to curb poaching of tigers which are on the verge of extinction;

(b) if so, whether the Government propose to formulate a comprehensive scheme under the Wild Life Protection Act and Project Tiger to prevent poaching of tigers;

(c) if so, the details thereof; and

(d) the details of population of tigers as on June 30, 2000 in the country, State-wise?.

THE MINISTRY OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI BABU LAL MARANDI): (a) Yes, Sir. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in its order dated 20.4.2000, in the SLP (Civil) No. 1474/1998 has directed the Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India to convene a meeting of Chief Secretaries of the State which have tiger population in the country to evolve a joint strategy for protecting tiger from further depletion and file an affidavit. In compliance with the above, Secretary, Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India convened meetings with the Chief Secretaries of the States concerned.

(b) and (c) Action taken by the Government of India for the prevention of poaching of Tigers is given in Statement-I (See below).

(a) The last census of population of tigors was carried out in 1997 and the details are gfyen in Statcment-II.

Statement—I

Action taken to Present Poaching of Tigers

1. Setting up of a National Coordination Committee to control poaching and illegal trade in wildlife with enforcement agencies like customs, Revenue Intelligence, Indo-Tibetan Border Police, Border Security Force, Central Reserves Police, Coast Guards, State Police, Deputy Director, Wildilife Preservation & Scientific Organisation Like Zoological and Botanical Survey of India.
2. Training Programmes and Workshops have been organised to sensitize the above departments to be proactive in control of trade and smuggling of wildlife products.
3. A special co-ordination committee with Secretary (E&F), Special Secretary (Home), Director, CBI and representative of the Chairman, Central Board of Excise & Customs has been created to ensure better co-ordination in the efforts to curb smuggling of wildlife products.

4. Central assistance is being provided to State Governments to strengthen the protection infrastructure including armed squads, vehicles communication network and co-ordination between the Park Managers.
5. Schemes for awards and rewards for outstanding performance and acts of valor has been introduced to encourage detection and reporting.
6. The State Governments have been advised to strengthen vigilance and intensify patrolling.
7. Supporting programmers of Institutions and NGOs in exploring tiger-trade routes and developing a forensic identification reference Manual for tiger parts and products.
8. Site specific special force in Project Tiger Areas.
9. Special Strike Force all over the Country to control Trade.
10. Creation of wildlife trade control bureau.

Statement—II

Population of tiger in the country as per 1997 census as reported by the States

S. No.	Name of the State	1997
1.	TAMIL NADU	62
2.	MAHARASHTRA	257
3.	WEST BENGAL	361
4.	KARNATAKA	350
5.	BIHAR	103
6.	ASSAM	458
7.	RAJASTHAN	58
8.	MADHYA PRADESH	927
9.	UTTAR PRADESH	475
10.	ANDHRA PRADESH	171

s. No	Name of State.	1997
11.	MIZORAM	12
12.	GUJARAT	1
13.	GOA DAMAN & DIU	6
14.	ORISSA	194
	TOTAL	3435
15.	KERALA	N.R.
16.	MEGHLAYA	N.R.
17.	NAGALAND	N.R.
18.	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	N.R.

N.R .—Not reported by States.

Impact of detergents on rivers and water bodies

658. SHRI C. RAMACHANDR AIAH: Will the Ministcj of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state.

(a) whether Government have done any study on the negative impact of detergents on rivers and water bodies in the eountry;

(b) if so, what steps Government propose to prevent further pollution of rivers;

(c) whether any campaign has been launched to restrict use of chemical detergents; and

(d) if so, *the* derails thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI BABU LAL MARANDI): (a) The Ministry of Environment and Forests has not sponsored any study on the negative impact of detergents on rivers and water bodies. Published literature is available to indicate that one of the serious problems associated with detergents is the concentration of nutrients which when discharged results in the cutrophication of the receiving water body or river.

(b) Detergents mostly reach the rivers and water bodks through surface drains carrying municipal waste water. Action Haas to